

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1 through 10 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3 and 7 have been amended.

Regarding the Specification

Applicant appreciates that the objection to the specification has been withdrawn.

Regarding the § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-3 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered by *Kochi* (U.S. Patent No. 5,721,596) in view of *Kasai et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,120).

Applicant would agree with the Examiner that *Kochi* teaches a display device that is an active matrix liquid crystal display device that has groups of pixels (a_{11} , a_{12} , a_{13} . . .) Applicant would also agree with the Examiner that *Kochi* teaches a plurality of semiconductor devices in the form of individual "pixel transistors" wherein each semiconductor device is associated with a different group of pixels. Applicant notes that these pixel individual transistors are for driving various ones of the liquid crystal pixels in each group of pixels. Applicant would also agree that *Kochi* does not teach picture scaling means.

With respect to *Kasai*, Applicant would agree that *Kasai* teaches a data conversion section 4 that converts the display data 2 and the timing signals 3 into the liquid display data 5 and the liquid crystal display timing signal 6 matched with the liquid crystal panel 7 for output. Applicant also notes that Figure 7 of *Kasai* teaches a display mode determination section 51 that determines the display mode from the

timing signals 3 and the display signal 52 matched with the resolution of the liquid panel 7 for display. See *Kasai* column 8, lines 1-19.

Applicant notes that neither *Kochi* or *Kasai* teach, allude to or render obvious a plurality of integrated circuit (IC) devices, "wherein each IC device is mainly associated with a different group of pixels." *Kochi* teaches some individual semiconductor pixel transistors being associated with different groups of pixels, but does not teach, allude to, or render obvious placing an integrated circuit device within the group 1, group 2 or group 3 boxes in drawing 1 created and provided by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action. The pixel driving circuitry of *Kochi* being integrated circuitry 31, 32 and 39 are taught in *Kochi* to be generally associated with all the groups of pixels. Furthermore, *Kochi* does not teach, allude to, or render obvious positioning each of the plurality of IC devices within "the defined area of the group of pixels that [the IC device] is mainly associated with."

With respect to *Kasai*, *Kasai* also does not teach, allude to, or render obvious the plurality of IC devices, "wherein each IC device is mainly associated with a different group of pixels, and wherein each IC device is positioned within the defined area of the group of pixels that it is mainly associated with." Furthermore, although *Kasai* does allude to data converters, 24, 25, and 26, as indicated by the Examiner, *Kasai* does not teach, allude to, or render obvious multiple data converters 24, 25, and 26, provided on each one of a plurality of IC devices that are each associated with a different group of pixels and that each comprise "drive means for driving pixels dependent on data to be displayed and a picture scaling means."

Claim 1, as amended, recites a plurality of IC devices, "wherein each IC device is mainly associated with a different group of pixels wherein each IC device is positioned within the defined area of the group of pixels that it is mainly associated with, the IC device comprises drive means for driving pixels dependent on data to be displayed and a picture scaling means." Since the cited art does not teach, allude to, or render obvious such a plurality of integrated circuit devices each being associated

with a different group of pixels, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach, allude to, or render obvious Claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn and submits that Claim 1 is ready for allowance.

Claims 2, 3 and 10 are each directly dependent upon independent Claim 1 and are therefore not rendered obvious for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to Claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn and submits that Claims 2, 3 and 10 are ready for allowance.

Claims 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious by *Kochi* and *Kasai* and further in view of *Nomura et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,866,520). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious by *Kochi*, *Kasai*, *Nomura*, and further in view of *Anwyl et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,576,738). And, Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious by *Kochi*, *Kasai*, and further in view of *Takeda* (U.S. Patent No. 4,903,013).

Applicant notes that Claims 4-7, 8 and 9 are each either directly or indirectly dependent upon independent Claim 1. Applicant respectfully points out that none of the additional cited art, *Nomura*, *Anwyl*, or *Takeda*, alleviate the deficiencies of the *Kochi-Kasai* references. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4-9 are not rendered obvious by the cited art and respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find this application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may be best resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Greenfield

Reg. 38,166

Att'y for Applicant(s)

P.O. Box 741715
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715
Phone: (972) 479-0462
Fax: (972) 479-0464